

REMARKS

Claims 11-15, 17, 20, 21 and 23-27 are pending in this application. Claims 12, 14, 15 and 21 are amended and claim 22 is cancelled.

The Office Action objected to claims 15 and 22 as being redundant. By this Amendment, claim 22 is cancelled to obviate the objection. Claim 15 is amended to correct a grammatical error. As a result, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

The Claimed Invention

An exemplary embodiment of the invention, as recited by independent claim 11, is directed to a dishwasher with a door seal having a fixing area, a sealing element, and a sealing strip, the fixing area being connected to the sealing element by means of the sealing strip.

Another exemplary embodiment of the invention, as recited by independent claim 21, is directed to a dishwasher with a door seal having a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from a sealing element; and a fixing area that is fixed to the container to create a seal with the container, the fixing area being stationary relative to the container when the door is pivoted between the closed position and the open position.

An object of the invention is to provide a dishwasher door seal that provides adequate sealing for the life of the dishwasher, is easy to install, and is more difficult to remove than it is to install.

The invention addresses and solves these problems by providing a dishwasher with a door seal having a fixing area, a sealing element, and a sealing strip, the fixing area being connected to the sealing element by means of the sealing strip.

The Hechtl Reference

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0117194 to Hechtl. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants reassert the arguments presented in the previous Amendment A.

Claim 11 includes the feature of a door seal having a fixing area, a sealing element, and a sealing strip. The sealing element is described in the specification as having features that increase longitudinal rigidity, such as the ribs and recesses 6 and the reinforcing ribs 7 (Page 5, lines 25-31). In contrast, Hechtl does not teach or suggest any features of the office action-defined sealing element (groove-like mount 15) that increase longitudinal rigidity.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Hechtl does not disclose each and every feature of claim 11 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is inappropriate. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Kim Reference

The Office Action rejected claims 12-15, 17, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0257816 to Kim. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 21 includes the feature of a fixing area that is fixed to the container to create a seal with the container, the fixing area being stationary relative to the container when the door is pivoted between the closed position and the open position. In contrast, the Office Action defined fixing area (gasket 240) of Kim is not fixed to tub 110. Also, gasket 240 is not stationary relative to tub 110 when the door is pivoted between the closed position and the open position. Gasket 240 slides along tub 210 as door 200 is pivoted between the open and closed positions. The sliding-type seal of gasket 240 can

provide inadequate sealing over time due to the relative movement between the door and the container/tub.

Claim 21 also includes the feature of a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from the sealing element, the sealing lip being pressed against the inner surface of the door to create a seal with the door. In contrast, the Office Action defined sealing lip (vertical upper part 231) is not pressed against the inner surface door 200 and does not create a seal with door 200. Vertical upper part 231 is formed of a hard material and is a part of bracket 230 that mounts bracket 230 to hinge frame 220. Door liner 210 is a continuous piece that is behind bracket 230 in Fig. 2. Vertical upper part 231 of bracket 230 does not contact door liner 210 and has no sealing effect. In addition, vertical upper part 231 is not flexible, it is rigid (paragraph 0040).

Claim 12 includes the feature of the fixing area being adapted for connection to an edge of the washing container. In contrast, gasket 240 of Kim is not adapted for connection to tub 110. Further, gasket 240 is not adapted for connection to an edge of tub 110.

Claim 14 includes the feature of the fixing area contributing to the sealing effect on an edge of the washing container. In contrast, gasket 240 of Kim does not contribute to the sealing effect on an edge of tub 110.

Claim 22 is cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Kim does not disclose each and every feature of claims 12-15, 17, 21 and 22 and therefore rejection under 35 USC §102(e) is inappropriate. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 20 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim.

Claims 20 and 24-26 depend from claim 21.

Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to correct the deficiencies

of Kim discussed above. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that it would have been obvious to correct the deficiencies of Kim discussed above.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Kim Reference in view of the Hechtl Reference and the Hahn Reference

The Office Action rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0117194 to Hechtl and U.S. Patent No. 5,566,954 to Hahn. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained above, Kim does not teach or suggest, for example, the feature of a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from the sealing element. Neither Hechtl nor Hahn remedies the deficiencies of Kim.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that Hechtl or Hahn teaches or suggests the feature of a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from the sealing element, as recited in independent claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Kim Reference in view of the Thompson Reference

The Office Action rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,916,864 to Thompson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As explained above, Kim does not teach or suggest, for example, the feature of a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from the sealing element. Thompson does not remedy the deficiencies of Kim.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that Thompson teaches or suggests the feature of a flexible sealing lip connected to and extending from the sealing element, as recited in independent claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 11-15, 17, 20, 21 and 23-27 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andre Pallapies/

Andre Pallapies

Registration No. 62,246

June 02, 2010

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
andre.pallapies@bshg.com